LIBRARY
SUPREME COURT, U. S.

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 5 1968
JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

In the
Supreme Court of the United States
OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No. 386

ALINE SWINFORD,

Petitioner,

v.

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT DALLAS

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT

JOHN D. CRAWFORD and
JOHN LOUIS SHOOK
of
LOCKE, PURNELL, BOREN,
LANEY & NEELY,
3600 Republic National
Bank Tower,
Dallas, Texas 75201,
DIXON W. HOLMAN,
2808 Fairmount,
Dallas, Texas,
Attorneys for Respondent.

P. O. BOX 10543 — 2263 VALDINA STREET — DALLAS — ME 1-3130
THE WARLICK PRESS DIVISION, STECK-WARLICK CO.

INDEX

	Page
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	2
Rules and Statutes Involved	4
Statement	5
Counter Points to Petitioner's Points I and II	7
Argument	7
Conclusion	12
Certificate of Service	12

Page

Blum v. Strong, 71 Tex. 321, on rehearing 330 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1888) 11

Burnett v. Cory Corporation, 352 S.W. 2d 502 (C.C.A., Dallas 1961 Writ Rf'd. n.r.e.) 9

C.I.O. v. McAdory, 325 U.S. 472 ..... 3, 11

City of Deer Park v. State, 275 S.W. 2d 77, 85 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1955) 3, 11

Doyle v. Atwell, 261 U.S. 590 ..... 4, 11

Eustis v. Bolles, 150 U.S. 361 ..... 4, 11

Gulbenkian v. Penn., 151 Tex. 412, 252 S.W. 2d 929 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1952) 9

Gulf, C. & S.F. Ry. Co. v. McBride, 159 Tex. 442, 322 S.W. 2d 492 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1958) 9

Hulbert v. City of Chicago, 202 U.S. 275 ..... 3, 11

Kitten v. Vaughn, 397 S.W. 2d 530 (CCA Austin, 1965) 12

Kuper v. Schmidt, 161 Tex. 189, 338 S.W. 2d 948 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1960) 9

London Terrace, Inc. v. McAlister, 180 S.W. 2d 619, 622 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1944) 3, 11

Pacific Fire Ins. Co. v. Donald, 224 S.W. 2d 204, 205 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1949) 3, 11

Richardson Mach. Co. v. Scott, 276 U.S. 128, 133 4

Rogers v. Winters, 341 S.W. 2d 417, 420 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1950) 3-4, 11

Sessions Co. v. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., 344 S.W. 2d 180 (CCA, Dallas 1961 Writ Rf'd. n.r.e.) 9

S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Oklahoma, 303 U.S. 206, 213 ..... 4, 11

Swinford v. Allied Finance Company of Casa View, 424 S.W. 2d 298 (C.C.A. Dallas, Writ Rf'd. w.o.j.) 4

Page

Tips v. Security Life & Accident Company, 191 S.W. 2d 470, 472 (Sup. Ct. of Texas 1945) 3, 11

Viator v. Stone, et al., 336 U.S. 948 ..... 4, 11

Statutes

Article 4626, Revised Civil Statutes of Texas 4, 12

28 U.S.C.A., Section 1257(3) 2

Rules

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 120a 4, 7, 10

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 175 ..... 4, 10

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 469(c) 3, 4

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure 476 ..... 3, 4

Miscellaneous

21 Texas Bar Journal, pp. 75, 76 ..... 4, 11

In the

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1968

No. 386

ALINE SWINFORD,

Petitioner,

v.

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW,

Respondent.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH SUPREME JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AT DALLAS

BRIEF FOR THE RESPONDENT

To the Chief Justice and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States:

OPINION BELOW

Respondent would show this Honorable Court that the opinion delivered in the court below herein has been reported in the South Western Reporter, Second Series, Vol. 424, p. 298. (Appendix A, A 1-8)

JURISDICTION

Certiorari is not available to Petitioner for two reasons:

First Reason: Petitioner's points raised in her Petition for Writ of Certiorari raise failure to give notice of the Trial Court's proceedings, whereas such position is not found to have been presented to the highest court of the State of Texas in which review could be had, which is required to be done under Title 28 U.S.C.A., Section 1257(3) (Appendix B, B-1) Petitioner in her Petition for Writ of Certiorari at pages 5 & 6 claims her Fifth Point of Error presented to the Supreme Court of Texas by way of her Application for Writ of Error preserves error to be reviewed by this Honorable Court. Such Fifth Point of Error wholly failed to apprise the Supreme Court of Texas of Petitioner's complaint of failure to give notice of the Trial Court's proceedings.

It is apparent in reading Petitioner's Fifth Point of Error contained in Petitioner's Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas that no mention is made of failure to give notice of the Trial Court's proceedings. Petitioner's Fifth Point reads as follows:

> "FIFTH POINT: Such court erred in holding that cumulative errors was not contrary to Const., United States of America, Amend. 14, Sec. 1."

Petitioner having failed to assign the same error in her Application for Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas as is presented here in her Petition for Writ of Certiorari puts her in the same position as the Petitioner in

the case of *C.I.O. v. McAdory*, 325 U.S. 472. In the C.I.O. case this Honorable Court held that contentions not specifically and precisely raised and properly presented to the Alabama Supreme Court could not be reviewed by the United States Supreme Court as it is without jurisdiction to consider such points that were not raised in the Alabama Supreme Court. See also *Hulbert v. City of Chicago*, 202 U.S. 275.

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules 469(c) and 476 (Appendix C, C-1; D, D-1) require that the Petitioner in making her Application for Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas, the highest court of the State in which a decision could be had, must set forth points of error relied upon, separately numbered, and that only such questions of law raised by assignments of error in an Application for Writ of Error can be considered by the Supreme Court of Texas. As in the *C.I.O. v. McAdory* case, *supra*, where this Honorable Court cites Alabama cases and authorities, and points out that assignments of error must be preserved in the Alabama Supreme Court, likewise Texas cases and authorities are legion to show that points not raised in assignments of error in an Application for Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas are abandoned and waived. *City of Deer Park v. State*, 275 S.W. 2d 77, 85 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1955); *London Terrace, Inc. v. McAlister*, 180 S.W. 2d 619, 622 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1944); *Tips v. Security Life & Accident Company*, 191 S.W. 2d 470, 472 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1945); *Pacific Fire Ins. Co. v. Donald*, 224 S.W. 2d 204, 205 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1949); *Rogers v. Winters*, 341 S.W.

2d 417, 420 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1950); *21 Texas Bar Journal*, p. 75, 76, "Some Problems of Supreme Court Review" by Robert W. Calvert, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Texas (now Chief Justice).

Second Reason: Further, certiorari is not available to Petitioner as the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of Texas with writ of error refused for want of jurisdiction by the Supreme Court of Texas decided the instant case on independent and adequate non-federal grounds which were amply supported by direct precedent cited by the Court of Civil Appeals for the Fifth Supreme Judicial District of Texas, such authorities being clear, concise and controlling of all issues presented to the trial court by Petitioner. *Swinford v. Allied Finance Company of Casa View*, 424 S.W. 2d 298 (CCA Dallas, 1968 Writ Rf'd. w.o.j.) (Appendix A, A-1-8) Accordingly, this Honorable Court does not have jurisdiction to grant writ of certiorari. *Doyle v. Atwell*, 261 U.S. 590; *Eustis v. Bolles*, 150 U.S. 361, *Viator v. Stone*, et al., 336 U.S. 948. *S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Oklahoma*, 303 U.S. 206, 213; *Richardson Mach. Co. v. Scott*, 276 U.S. 128, 133.

RULES AND STATUTES INVOLVED

Texas Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 120a. (Appendix E, E-1), Rule 175 (Appendix F, F-1), 469(c) (Appendix C, C-1), Rule 476 (Appendix D, D-1). Art. 4626 Revised Civil Statutes of Texas, 1925, as amended. (Appendix G, G-1)

STATEMENT

The Respondent filed Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment on March 13, 1967 which contains a fiat ordering a hearing thereon set for March 31, 1967 at 9:00 o'clock A.M. (Appendix H, H-1, 2, R. p. 25, and 26). Respondent sent Petitioner a copy of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment together with notice of the hearing on same being set for March 31, 1967 at 9:00 o'clock A.M. by way of Respondent's letter dated March 13, 1967 and bearing a March 13, 1967 file mark of the County Court Clerk on a copy thereof. (Appendix I, I-1, Supp. R. p. 5). Petitioner had notice of the hearing on the summary judgment as she filed her Memorandum to the Court on March 21, 1967 which stated, "I. That Plaintiff has heretofore filed its motion for summary judgment wherein Plaintiff alleges that Defendant has answered in this cause * * *". (Appendix J, J-1, 2; R. p. 33)

The Trial Court's Docket sheet reflects:

"* * * Pls Mo set 3/31/67 Pl
3/31/67 Defts. Plea in Abatement overruled F.R.H.
3/31/67 Plfs Mo for S.J. granted F.R.H.
4/3/67 Final Judgment signed and entered 4/498-99
* * *"

Said Docket sheet shows that there was neither a hearing nor a proceeding on April 3, 1967 other than the mere formality of signing and entering the Final Judgment reflecting in the court's minutes the Court's rulings of overruling Petitioner's Plea in Abatement and granting Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment, both of which were proceeded upon, heard and ruled on at the hearing

on March 31, 1967 by the Hon. Fred Red Harris (F.R.H.), Judge of the County Court at Law No. 3 of Dallas County, Texas. Judge Harris' initials appear after his March 31, 1967 rulings on the Docket Sheet. (Appendix K, K-1, Supp. R. p. 4)

The Trial Court's Final Judgment finds and recites that the Petitioner, "* * * was duly notified of such motion (Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment) and setting thereon * * *". (Appendix L, L-1, 2, R. 34 and 35)

The Court of Civil Appeals opinion states the record in this case is abundantly clear that Petitioner had due notice of the Motion for Summary Judgment. (Appendix A, A-1-8, R. 98)

Petitioner's Statement of the Case concerning (i) Petitioner and her former husband, (ii) expenditures by the husband as manager of their community estate, and (iii) the former husband marrying a different woman and making monthly payments are all statements that cannot be considered correct and Respondent challenges the same as there is no support in the record for such statements.

Petitioner's statement (at pages 5 and 6 of Petitioner's Writ of Certiorari) that the same federal question (as was raised in the court of Civil Appeals) by way of the Fifth Point of Error was preserved in her Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas is incorrect as said Fifth Point in no way mentions failure to give notice of a hearing.

Petitioner did not preserve any error to the Supreme Court of Texas concerning a failure to give notice of the Trial Court's proceedings as claimed in Petitioner's Petition for Writ of Certiorari at pages 5 and 6 because the claimed preserved error contained in Petitioner's Application for Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas reads as follows: "Fifth Point: Such court erred in holding that cumulative errors was not contrary to Const., United States of America, Amend. 14, Sec. 1."

Petitioner's statement that she challenged the Trial Court's jurisdiction over her person and the subject matter involved by filing a special appearance under T.R.C.P., No. 120a, found at page 3 of Petitioner's Writ for Certiorari, is incorrect as T.R.C.P. No. 120a in substance says that every appearance prior to judgment *not in compliance* with T.R.C.P. No. 120a is a general appearance. Petitioner's appearance was not for the purpose of objecting to the jurisdiction over the person or property of the Petitioner on the ground that Petitioner or her property is not amenable to process issued by the courts of this State. Accordingly, Petitioner has misconstrued the application of T.R.C.P. No, 120a.

COUNTER POINTS TO PETITIONER'S POINTS I AND II

PETITIONER WAS ACCORDED DUE PROCESS IN THAT SHE HAD NOTICE OF THE ONLY TRIAL COURT PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED WHICH WERE ON MARCH 31, 1967

ARGUMENT

Petitioner would have this court believe that there was a hearing on April 3, 1967, a Star Chamber proceeding if

you please, of which she had no notice. The truth of the matter is, there was no hearing whatsoever on April 3, 1967. The only proceeding was had on March 31, 1967, of which Petitioner had notice but nevertheless failed to appear. Such circumstances are substantiated by these facts:

1. The fiat on Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment filed with the court established the hearing thereon for March 31, 1967 at 9:00 o'clock A.M.

2. Petitioner acknowledges notice of the Motion for Summary Judgment and hearing thereon in her March 21, 1967 filed instrument designated "Memorandum to the Court".

3. Respondent by letter dated March 13, 1967 mailed to Petitioner's Attorney of Record, Jerry M. Hyde, notified Petitioner of the Motion for Summary Judgment and the hearing thereon.

4. The Trial Court's Final Judgment and the opinion of the Court of Civil Appeals establishes that the Petitioner had notice of the hearing and the court's proceedings on Respondent's Motion for Summary Judgment.

5. The Docket sheet entries show the hearing on March 31, 1967 and the signing and entry of Final Judgment on April 3, 1967, but no hearing.

Although the Petitioner had notice of the Summary Judgment hearing held on March 31, 1967 she not only failed to appear but also failed to controvert the Motion for Summary Judgment. Petitioner elected to remain silent and not appear at the hearing. At such hearing the burden of proof was definitely upon Petitioner to establish the nonexistence of issuable facts. Respondent did this by introducing extrinsic evidence by way of note and affidavit in support of its position, thereby demonstrating its right to recover. Under such circumstances the Trial Court's judgment is proper. *Gulbenkian v. Penn*, 151 Tex. 412, 252 S.W. 2d 929 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1952); *Gulf, C. & S.F. Ry. Co. v. McBride*, 159 Tex. 442, 322 S.W. 2d 492 (Sup. Ct. of Tex., 1958) *Sessions Co. v. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co.*, 344 S.W. 2d 180 (CCA, Dallas 1961 Writ Rf'd. n.r.e.); *Kuper v. Schmidt*, 161 Tex. 189, 338 S.W. 2d 948 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1960); and *Burnett v. Cory Corporation*, 352 S.W. 2d 502 (CCA, Dallas 1961 Writ Rf'd. n.r.e.). Later she tries to conjure up constitutional error on the basis of having no notice of an April 3, 1967 hearing. Petitioner had no need of notice of a hearing on April 3, 1967 as there was no hearing. What happened was that the hearings were held on March 31, 1967 as scheduled, thereupon the Court made its rulings and docket sheet entries and then asked the Respondent's attorney to draw up a judgment and mail it in for signing and entry, the Trial Court in signing and entering the

Final Judgment on April 3, 1967 also filled in the same date at the beginning of the judgment. This many times happens without incident, but the Petitioner has by fantasy and much endeaver, labored on and on. The Court of Civil Appeals opinion, by direct precedent cited, answers all of Petitioner's contentions in such a way that even had Petitioner been present at the hearing and had waxed most eloquently, the outcome of the case would have been no different. Therefore it would be completely useless and and serve no purpose for this Honorable Court to in any way change the judgment against Petitioner.

Petitioner misconstrues the application of T.R.C.P. No. 120a and failed to avail herself of such rule in that Petitioner in her pleadings failed to make reference to T.R.C.P. No. 120a and did not allege that her Plea in Abatement was for the purpose of objecting to the jurisdiction of the court over her person or property on the grounds that she and her property were not amenable to process issued by the courts of the State.

Petitioner may not be heard to complain about the court's ruling on her Plea in Abatement on March 31, 1967, at which time the case was called for trial on the summary judgment as T.R.C.P. No. 175 provides that all pleas in abatement remaining undisposed of shall be determined when a case is called for trial. The Petitioner in failing to

appear on March 31, 1967 waived her plea in abatement by failing to specially invoke the action of the trial court upon her plea in abatement. *Blum v. Strong*, 71 Tex. 321, on rehearing 330 (Sup. Ct. of Tex. 1888).

Respondent pointed out heretofore under its Jurisdiction point that certiorari is not available to Petitioner because everything before this Court makes it abundantly clear that Petitioner failed to preserve the error claimed here when she omitted a point on failure to give notice of the Trial Court's proceedings in her Application for Writ of Error to the Supreme Court of Texas. *C.I.O. v. McAdory, supra; Hulbert v. City of Chicago, supra; City of Deer Park v. State supra; London Terrace, Inc. v. McAlister, supra; Tips v. Security Life & Accident Company, supra; Pacific Fire Ins. Co. v. Donald, supra; Rogers v. Winters, supra; 21 Texas Bar Journal, p. 75, 76.* Additionally, certiorari is not available to Petitioner for the reason that this case was decided by the courts below on independent and adequate non-federal grounds which under the direct precedent cited by the Court of Civil Appeals opinion would preclude a favorable result for the Petitioner in any event. *Doyle v. Atwell, supra; Eustis v. Bolles, supra; Viator v. Stone, supra, S.W. Bell Tel. Co. v. Oklahoma, supra; Richardson Mach. Co. v. Scott, supra.* The Petitioner's attack on a personal judgment against her on grounds of coveture is precluded by the holding of the Court of Civil Appeals in

its opinion below, *Article 4626, Revised Civil Statutes of Texas 1925, as amended,* and the case of *Kitten v. Vaughn,* 397 S.W. 2d 530 (CCA Austin, 1965).

CONCLUSION

This Court should not grant certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN D. CRAWFORD and

/s/ JOHN LOUIS SHOOK

JOHN LOUIS SHOOK,
of
LOCKE, PURNELL, BOREN,
LANEY & NEELY,
3600 Republic National
Bank Tower,
Dallas, Texas 75201,

DIXON W. HOLMAN,
2808 Fairmount,
Dallas, Texas,
Attorneys for Respondent.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorneys of record for Respondent hereby certify that a true copy hereof was served upon all parties required to be served by depositing the same in the United States Post Office at Dallas, Texas, as prepaid first class certified mail, addressed to Mr. Jerry M. Hyde, 5010 San Jacinto, Apt. J., Dallas, Texas, 75206 and Mr. Thomas P. Brown III, 1008 20th St., N.W., Washington, D. C. 20005, (by air mail) attorneys for petitioner, on the 4th day of September, 1968.

/s/ JOHN LOUIS SHOOK

John Louis Shook

No. 17,007

FROM COUNTY COURT AT LAW NO. 3
OF
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS.

ALINE SWINFORD,
Appellant,

v.

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW,
Appellee.

Allied Finance Company of Casa View brought this action against Aline Swinford and Weldon Glenn Swinford seeking judgment for the unpaid balance of a promissory note and also for the foreclosure of a chattel mortgage on certain personal property given as security for said note. The defendant Weldon Glenn Swinford was subsequently dismissed from the action. Defendant Aline Swinford filed her plea in abatement alleging the pendency of bankruptcy proceedings in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas involving the same indebtedness and security. She also filed numerous special exceptions, followed by a general denial. Plaintiff filed its motion for summary judgment in due form and supported by proper affidavit. Defendant failed to appear and answer or otherwise controvert the summary judgment motion. Upon hear-

ing, the trial court overruled the plea in abatement and sustained the motion for summary judgment. Aline Swinford appeals from such judgment. We affirm.

Appellant earnestly contends that the trial court was in error in rendering a summary judgment without considering and ruling upon appellant's special exceptions to appellee's pleading. It is true that appellant filed four special exceptions complaining of appellee's original petition, same presenting questions concerning the pendency of the bankruptcy proceedings, coverture of appellant, and lack of necessary party. However, the record is entirely silent and does not disclose that appellant at any time presented said exceptions to the trial court and secure the court's ruling thereon. Under such condition of the record we hold that all such special exceptions were waived.

This court, speaking through Mr. Justice Bateman, in Cook v. Jaynes, 366 S.W. 2d 646 (Tex. Civ. App., Dallas 1963), stated the rule:

> "We make the same disposition of appellant's point that the summary judgment should not have been granted until appellant's special exceptions had been acted upon. We agree that the proper, orderly manner for trial courts to dispose of such matters is to pass on objections to pleadings before rendering judgment, but there is nothing in this record to indicate that appellant called these exceptions to the trial court's attention or requested action thereon. If he did not do so, the exceptions were waived. Rule 90, Vernon's Texas R.C.P."

To the same effect see 3 Tex. Jur. 2d §117, p. 386; 45 Tex. Jur. 2d, §187, p. 748; Wilson v. Clarke Floor Machine Co.,

380 S.W. 2d 768 (Tex. Civ. App., Eastland 1964); and White v. Allstate Ins. Co., 386 S.W. 2d 601 (Tex. Civ. App., Beaumont 1965, Writ Ref'd n.r.e.).

We have examined each of the special exceptions and find that the same are without merit so that any possible error on the part of the court in failing to pass upon the same would be harmless. Rule 434, Vernon's Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

Appellant next contends that the trial court erroneously granted summary judgment against her because of the dismissal of Weldon Glenn Swinford. This argument is based upon the proposition that at the time the note sued upon was executed by her she was the wife of Weldon Glenn Swinford; that subsequently they were divorced and in the decree of divorce it was adjudged that all community debts were to be paid by the husband, Weldon Glenn Swinford. She argues, therefore, that Weldon Glenn Swinford became the principal obligor upon the note sued upon and, perforce Art. 2088, Vernon's Ann. Civ. St. of Texas and Rule 163, T.R.C.P., the court could not properly dismiss him from the action. Appellant's contention cannot be sustained.

The only way we can ascertain the facts concerning the marital status of the parties as well as the divorce proceedings is from the certified copy of the divorce decree attached to defendant's answer.

The note sued upon is standard in form and provides that the signers thereof were jointly and severally obligated to pay same. Both Aline Swinford and Weldon Glenn Swin-

ford signed the note and thereby became joint obligors. Assuming the parties were man and wife at that time and were, subsequently divorced and the judgment of the divorce court imposed liability upon the husband for the indebtedness, yet, such action could have no legal effect upon the rights of the holder and owner of the note. Appellee is not shown to have been a party to or had any notice of the divorce action or the judgment rendered therein. It is well settled that the rights of any owner in property, aside from the exempt property, are, in a very important sense, subordinate to the rights of his creditors. The court in a divorce action has no power to disturb the rights which creditors lawfully have against the parties. As stated in 3 Speer's Marital Rights in Texas, §840, p. 201:

> "In truth, however, the partitioning of the community property is not a disposition of it at all. There is no change of owners, but a mere ascertainment and separation of the interests theretofore exercised in common. It remains subject to the demands of creditors, and the wife receiving and appropriating property in the partition that would otherwise be liable to creditors, becomes personally liable, to the extent of the property so received, for the payment of the debts."

Since appellant was a principal obligor on the note she may be sued either alone or jointly with Weldon Glenn Swinford, the other principal obligor, and it was not error for the court to dismiss one and allow recovery against the other. Art. 1986, V.A.C.S.; Shield v. First Coleman Nat. Bank of Coleman, 160 S.W. 2d 277 (Tex. Civ. App., Austin 1940, affirmed Sup. Ct. 1942, 140 Tex. 117, 166 S.W. 2d 688). Not being the only principal obligor on the note, Weldon

Glenn Swinford was not an indispensable or necessary party to the action.

Appellant next contends that the original petition was fatally defective on its face and therefore summary judgment was improper. Appellant argues that it was fundamental error for the court to enter judgment upon the petition which failed to allege that appellant was not a feme covert at the time of execution of the note sued upon or that the contractual consideration was actually furnished for necessaries for herself, or her separate estate. By a 1963 amendment of Art. 4626, V.A.C.S., it is expressly provided that a married woman shall have the same powers and capacity as if she were a feme sole, in her own name, to contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, and all her separate property, her personal earnings and the revenues from her separate estate which are not exempt from execution under the laws of Texas shall thereafter be subject to her debts and be liable therefor, and her contracts and obligations shall be binding on her. The Legislature, in 1963, also repealed Art. 4623 (House Bill 403, Ch. 472, p. 1188, Acts of 58th Legislature Regular Session) which dealt with property being subject to the payment of debts contracted by the wife except those contracted for necessaries furnished her or her children. Therefore, when the note in question was executed by appellant in this case on January 27, 1965 she was subject to the amended law which imposed liability upon her as a feme sole.

Appellant's identical contention was advanced and rejected in Kitten v. Vaughn, 397 S.W. 2d 530 (Tex. Civ. App., Austin 1965).

Appellant's next contention, to the effect that the trial court, by entering summary judgment in this case, interfered with the bankruptcy proceedings in the United States District Court contrary to statute, is likewise without merit and must be overruled for several reasons. It is apparent from the information contained in the various special exceptions as well as the plea in abatement that appellant herself was not a party to the bankruptcy proceedings pending in the federal court. Weldon Glenn Swinford, the other principal obligor on the note sued upon, was a party to the bankruptcy proceedings. The property incorporated in the chattel mortgage sought to be foreclosed in this action was listed by Weldon Glenn Swinford in the bankruptcy schedule.

It is settled law that a discharge in bankruptcy is personal to the bankrupt and does not have the effect of canceling or releasing the liability of a person jointly liable for a debt. 11 U.S.C.A., §34; Bradley v. Straus-Frank Co., 414 S.W. 2d 504 (Tex. Civ. App., Dallas 1967). Moreover, the record reveals that the bankruptcy court, acting through the trustee in bankruptcy, specifically abandoned and disclaimed all right, title and interest to the assets involved in this lawsuit. In view of these facts, apparent in this record, no possible conflict of jurisdiction is apparent which would vitiate the action of the state court in proceeding to summary judgment.

In a number of points appellant complains of the action of the trial court in proceeding to hear her plea in abatement, and overruling same, without giving her notice of the hearing. It is true that the judgment of the court does not affirmatively state that notice was given appellant prior to the hearing of the plea in abatement. We find it unnecessary to comment further upon the question of lack of notice of the hearing for the simple reason that even if we assume that the court was in error in failing to give notice of the hearing on the plea in abatement such error is not shown to have resulted in any harm or damage to appellant. This for the reason that the plea in abatement, as above demonstrated, is without merit, as a matter of law.

Appellant's argument that the court erred in not giving her notice of the hearing of the summary judgment is without merit. The judgment itself recites due notice of the motion and setting thereon and also recites that such motion was not controverted.

The record in this case is abundantly clear that appellant had due notice of the motion for summary judgment and made no attempt to controvert such motion as provided by Rule 166-A, T.R.C.P. No question of due order of pleading is involved nor would appellant have waived or abandoned any rights asserted by virtue of her plea in abatement and special exceptions had she proceeded to file controverting affidavit or other opposition to the motion. She elected to remain silent and not appear at the hearing. At such hearing the burden of proof was definitely upon appellee to establish the nonexistence of issuable facts. Appellee did this

by introducing extrinsic evidence in support of its position thereby demonstrating its right to recover. Under such circumstances the judgment is proper. Gulbenkian v. Penn, 151 Tex. 412, 252 S.W. 2d 929 (1952); Gulf, C. & S.F. Ry. Co. v. McBride, 159 Tex. 442, 322 S.W. 2d 492 (1958); Sessions Co. v. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., 344 S.W. 2d 180 (Tex. Civ. App., Dallas 1961); Kuper v. Schmidt, 161 Tex. 189, 338 S.W. 2d 948 (1960); and Burnett v. Cory Corporation, 352 S.W. 2d 502 (Tex. Civ. App., Dallas 1961).

We have carefully considered all of appellant's points and find the same to be without merit and are overruled.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

CLAUDE WILLIAMS, *Associate Justice*

DELIVERED:
January 26, 1968.

§ 1257. *State courts; appeal; certiorari*

Final judgments or decrees rendered by the highest court of a State in which a decision could be had, may be reviewed by the Supreme Court as follows: * * *

(3) By writ of certiorari, where the validity of a treaty or statute of the United States is drawn in question or where the validity of a State statute is drawn in question on the ground of its being repugnant to the Constitution, treaties or laws of the United States, or where any title, right, privilege or immunity is specially set up or claimed under the Constitution, treaties or statutes of, or commission held or authority exercised under, the United States. June 25, 1948, c. 646, 62 Stat. 929.

Rule 469. *Requisites of Application*

The fact that the docket of the Supreme Court is overcrowded makes it imperative that applications for writs of error be as brief as possible. The attorneys are urged to cooperate with the Court in this respect, in order to reduce the work of the Court. The respondent is urged to file a reply.

The application for writ of error shall be addressed to "The Supreme Court of Texas," and shall state the name of the party or parties applying for the writ. The parties shall be designated as "Petitioner" and "Respondent." The application shall contain the following: * * *

(c) Points of Error. The points of error relied upon, separately numbered, shall be stated in short form and without argument and be germane to some assignment of error in the motion for new trial in the trial court, or otherwise saved in the statement of points as authorized by the rules, and likewise assigned as error in the motion for rehearing in the Court of Civil Appeals, and where Rule 377-a has been employed, saved in the statement there authorized. If the ruling complained of originated in the Court of Civil Appeals, it must also be assigned as error in the motion for rehearing in said court. * * *

Rule 476. *Trial on Questions of Law*

Trials in the Supreme Court shall be only upon the questions of law raised by the assignments of error in the application for writ of error, or upon the questions of law which were certified to the Supreme Court from a Court of Civil Appeals. The Supreme Court may require the original transcript to be sent up.

Rule 120a. ***Special Appearance***

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of Rules 121, 122, and 123, a special appearance may be made by any party either in person or by attorney for the purpose of objecting to the jurisdiction of the court over the person or property of the defendant on the ground that such party or property is not amenable to process issued by the courts of this State. A special appearance may be made as to an entire proceeding or as to any severable claim involved therein. Such special appearance shall be made by sworn motion filed prior to plea of privilege or any other plea, pleading or motion; provided, however, that a plea of privilege and any other plea, pleading, or motion may be contained in the same instrument or filed subsequent thereto without waiver of such special appearance. The issuance of process for witnesses, the taking of depositions, the serving of requests for admissions, and the use of discovery processes, shall not constitute a waiver of such special appearance. Every appearance, prior to judgment, not in compliance with this rule is a general appearance.

2. Any motion to the jurisdiction provided for herein shall be heard and determined before a plea of privilege or any other plea or pleading may be heard. No determination of any issue of fact in connection with the objection to jurisdiction is a determination of the merits of the case or any aspect thereof.

3. If the court sustains the objection to jurisdiction, an appropriate order shall be entered. If the objection to jurisdiction is overruled, the objecting party may thereafter appear generally for any purpose. Any such special appearance or such general appearance shall not be deemed a waiver of the objection to jurisdiction when the objecting party or subject matter is not amenable to process issued by the courts of this State. Added by order of April 12, 1962, effective Sept. 1, 1962.

Rule 175. ***Issue of Law and Dilatory Pleas***

When a case is called for trial in which there has been no pre-trial hearing as provided by Rule 166, the issues of law arising on the pleadings, all pleas in abatement and other dilatory pleas remaining undisposed of shall be determined; and it shall be no cause for postponement of a trial of the issues of law that a party is not prepared to try the issues of fact.

Art. 4626. *Power and capacity to contract and sue*

Text of article 4626 until January 1, 1968

A married woman shall have the same powers and capacity as if she were a feme sole, in her own name, to contract and be contracted with, sue and be sued, and all her separate property, her personal earnings and the revenues from her separate estate which is not exempt from execution under the laws of Texas shall thereafter be subject to her debts and be liable therefor, and her contracts and obligations shall be binding on her. As amended Acts 1963, 58th Leg., p. 1188, ch. 472, § 6, eff. Aug. 23, 1963.

H-1

No. CC-67-1003-c

IN THE COUNTY OF
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW
Plaintiff,

v.

ALINE SWINFORD, et al
Defendants.

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

To the Honorable Judge of Said Court:

COMES Now Allied Finance Company of Casa View, plaintiff in the above entitled and numbered cause, and, the defendant, Aline Swinford, having heretofore answered in this cause, respectfully moves the court to enter summary judgment for plaintiff under Rule 166-A of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and, as grounds therefor, would show unto the court as follows:

I.

That plaintiff's suit is to recover from the defendant, Aline Swinford, money due to plaintiff by virtue of the said defendant certain promissory note and chattel mortgage which is owned and held by the plaintiff, and to foreclose plaintiff's lien thereunder.

II.

That the pleadings on file herein show that there is no bona fide dispute as to any material fact between the plain-

tiff and the said defendant. That the plaintiff, as a matter of law, is entitled to judgment upon the production and introduction into evidence of the said promissory note and chattel mortgage.

III.

That attached hereto is an affidavit in support of this motion.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, plaintiff, Allied Finance Company of Casa View, prays that the Court set this motion for hearing and that, upon such hearing, summary judgment be granted to plaintiff as prayed in plaintiff's original petition.

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF
CASA VIEW

By: /s/ TAYLOR G. QUINCY

Dixon W. Holman
Carlos C. Miro
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RI 8-3454

FIAT

ON THIS 13 day of March, 1967, the attorney for plaintiff presented to me in chambers the foregoing Motion for Summary Judgment with request for service. It is ordered that hearing be had on such motion on the 31 day of March, 1967, at 9 o'clock a.m., of which the defendant will take due notice upon being served by mail with a copy of the motion and this fiat.

/s/ FRED RED HARRIS

Judge Presiding

March 13, 1967

FILED
MAR 14 1967
TOM E. ELLIS, Clerk County Court
of Dallas County, Texas
By [signature] Deputy

I-1

Certified - Return Receipt Requested

Mr . Jerry M. Hyde
Attorney at Law
2201 Walnut Street
Garland, Texas 75040

Re: Cause No. CC-67-1003-C
Allied Finance Company of Casa View
vs. Aline Swinford, et al

Dear Mr. Hyde:

Enclosed copies of Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and of its supporting affidavit.

Hearing on the motion has been set for March 31, 1967, at 9 o'clock a.m. in the County Court at Law #3, Dallas County, Texas.

Yours truly,

Carlos I. Miro

CIM/aj
encls.

cc: County Clerk
Dallas County
Dallas, Texas

NO. CC-67-1003-c. ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW Vs. ALINE SWINFORD, et al. Copy of Letter from Plaintiff's Attorney to Defendant's Attorney. FILED Mar. 14, 1967, TOM E. ELLIS, Clerk County Court of Dallas County, at Law No. 3 By (Signed) W.J. Richburg, Deputy

J-1

No. CC-67-1003-C

IN THE COUNTY COURT AT LAW #3
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW
Plaintiff

v.

ALINE SWINFORD, et al
Defendant

MEMORANDUM TO THE COURT

To the Honorable Judge of Said Court:

COMES NOW Aline Swinford, defendant in the above numbered and entitled cause, and subject to her plea in abatement, would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I

That plaintiff has heretofore filed its motion for summary judgement wherein plaintiff alleges that defendant has answered in this cause.

II

That defendant's plea in abatement is still pending in this Court, and has not been ruled upon by this Court, and all further pleadings in defendant's original answer were made expressly subject to her plea in abatement.

III

That until the Court rules on subject plea in abatement jurisdiction has not been conclusively established in the

above numbered and entitled cause and this Court cannot entertain any action upon the merits of this case until such plea in abatement has been ruled upon.

/s/ JERRY M. HYDE

JERRY M. HYDE
Attorney for Defendant,
ALINE SWINFORD
2201 Walnut Street
Garland, Texas 75040
Phone—BR 6-6141

NO. CC-67-1003-c. Allied Finance Company of Casa View v. Aline Swinford, et al. Memorandum To The Court. FILED Mar. 21, 1967, 2:00 P.M., TOM E. ELLIS, Clerk County Court of Dallas County, at Law No. 3, By (Signed) Mildred C. Anderson, Deputy.

K-1

CIVIL DOCKET

No. cc-67-1003-c

NAME OF PARTIES	ATTORNEYS	KIND OF ACTION	Date of Filing (Month / Day / Year)
Allied Finance Company of Casa View	Dixon W. Holman (Carlos I. Miro) P. O. Box 2998 Dallas, Texas RI-8-6496 Pltf.	Debt-Prom Note $17.50 Deposit	2 / 13 / 67 Jury Fee Paid By
Aline Swinford and Weldon Glenn Swinford	Jerry M. Hyde 2201 Walnut St Garland LA-6-6141 Deft.		

Date of Orders	ORDERS OF COURT
	Plfs Mo set 3/31/67 fl
~~3/24/67~~	
3/31/67	Defts Plea in Abatement overruled SDM
3/31/67	Plfs Mo for S.J. granted SDM
4/3/67	Final Judgement signed & entered 4/498-99

3/2/67 Plea in Abate (Aline)
3/2/67 Defts Reply to (Aline)
3/13/67 Plfs Mo S.J.
3/21/67 Memorandum to the Ct
3/31/67 Order of Trans Cts appointed Jno Authority to Declare
4/10/67 Notice of Appeal
4/10/67 Mo New Trial
4/25/67 Presentation of Mo for New Trial

L-1

No. CC-67-1003-c

IN THE COUNTY COURT AT LAW #3
DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

ALLIED FINANCE COMPANY OF CASA VIEW

Plaintiff

v.

ALINE SWINFORD, et al

Defendants

FINAL JUDGMENT

ON THIS the 3rd day of April, 1967, came on to be heard the above entitled and numbered cause, and came the Plaintiff, Allied Finance Company of Casa View, by its attorney of record and the defendent, Aline Swinford, having been duly cited and having filed a Plea in Abatement, and an Answer, came not further; said cause having heretobefore been dismissed as to defendant, Weldon Glenn Swinford; and defendant, Aline Swinford, having filed a Plea in Abatement, the Court, after hearing evidence and argument of counsel for plaintiff, is of the opinion that said plea is unmeritorious and should be overruled; and Plaintiff having filed a Motion for Summary Judgment which was set for this date, it appears to the court that the defendant, Aline Swinford, was duly notified of such Motion and setting thereon, and that such motion is not controverted;

And the Court is of the further opinion that the plaintiff is entitled to summary and final judgment against the defendant, Aline Swinford, and should recover of and from the said defendant the sum of $686.53 with interest thereon at the rate of 6% per annum from this date until paid, and all costs in this behalf expended; and further that the plaintiff should have foreclosure of its chattel mortgage

lien as the same existed on the 27th day of January, 1965, on the following described property, to wit:

1 Olympic Dual stereo cons.; 1 beige naugh sofa contemp; 1 coffee table marble ven; 1 Contemp aqua naugh chair; 1 Olympic 21" Cab. TV; 1 white lamp table; 1 Westinghouse refrig-freezer comb brown dble door; 1 Speed Queen washer; 1 Speed Queen dryer; 1 Brown dining table walnut ven w/4 orange chairs; 2 single beds sand m; 1 dresser blonde; 1 Motorola 21" Table model TV; 2 sing. beds s&m/H/B oak; 1 oak dble dressed w/mirror; 1 old chair; 1 dble bed w/s&m; 1 danish walnut dresser w/mirror; 1 Hotpoint refrig.

It is therefore, ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED by the Court that the Plea in Abatement of defendant, Aline Swinford, be and it is hereby overruled; and further that the plaintiff, Allied Finance Company of Casa View, a corporation, do have and recover of and from the defendant, Aline Swinford, the sum of $686.53 with interest thereon from this date until paid at the rate of 6% per annum, all costs in this behalf expended; and that plaintiff have foreclosure of its chattel martgage lien as same existed on January 27, 1965, for all of which let execution issue as provided by law.

RENDERED AND ENTERED this the 3rd day of April, 1967.

/s/ FRED RED HARRIS

Judge Presiding

NO. CC-67-1003-c. Allied Finance Company of Casa View v. Aline Swinford, et al. FINAL JUDGMENT. Entered in Volume 4, Pages 498, 499, Minutes of County Court at Law No. 3, Dallas County, Texas.